



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,514	10/08/2003	Joel L. Wittenberg	4906P148	2947
8791 7590 05/16/2007 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			EXAMINER O CONNOR, BRIAN T	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/682,514

Applicant(s)

WITTENBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Brian T. O'Connor

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/19/2005
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7, 15, 16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding et al. (US 6,775,687; hereafter Binding) in view of Ikudome et al. (US 6,779,118; hereafter Ikudome).

With respect to claim 1, Binding discloses a method with a network element (46, 47 of Figure 2) that redirects client requests for web pages (Abstract). This method receives a packet with a HTTP request from a client (10 of Figure 2; 300 of Figure 3D; 310 of Figure 3D) and employs a gateway or redirect facility (46 of Figure 2) that forwarding replies to a client with a redirected URL address (312 of Figure 3D; column 8, lines 53-60).

Binding fails to disclose the steps of examining the packet based on a policy to determine if the packet should be redirected.

Ikudome, in an invention related to redirecting packet, discloses a method of examining packets based on rules (206 of Figure 2; column 4, lines 33-49; where the database holds the rules for a client) with a redirection server (208 of Figure 2; column 6, lines 37-59; where the decision to redirect is based on the client or source address in the packet).

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of additional security by redirecting packet based on the client identity as shown in Ikudome. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

With respect to claim 2, Binding further discloses that the packet is sent to its original destination from a physical interface on main processing system (47 of Figure 2; 315 of Figure 3A) when more redirection is required (410, 430 of Figure 4).

With respect to claim 7, Binding fails to disclose examining the packet for HTTP requests.

Ikudome teaches checking if the packet is HTTP type (column 6, lines 43-45).

Ikudome realizes the benefit of additional dynamic control for filtering and redirecting Internet traffic by examining Internet packets for HTTP requests (column 2, lines 45-67). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

With respect to claim 15, Binding discloses a network element (46, 47 of Figure 2) that redirects client requests for web pages (Abstract). This method receives a packet with a HTTP request from a client (10 of Figure 2; 300 of Figure 3D; 310 of Figure 3D) and employs a gateway or redirect facility (46 of Figure 2) that forwarding replies to a client with a redirected URL address (312 of Figure 3D; column 8, lines 53-60).

Binding fails to disclose a redirect unit, a forwarding engine, and examining the packet based on a policy to determine if the packet should be redirected.

Ikudome, in an invention related to redirecting packet, discloses a method of examining packets based on rules (206 of Figure 2; column 4, lines 33-49; where the database holds the rules for a client) with a redirection server or redirect unit (208 of Figure 2; column 6, lines 37-59; where the decision to redirect is based on the client or source address in the packet) and a forwarding engine or networking server (102 of Figure 2).

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of additional security by redirecting packet based on the client identity as shown in Ikudome. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

With respect to claim 16, Binding fails to disclose a storage unit to hold a policy.

Ikudome discloses a database (206 of Figure 2) to store a rule or policy for each client.

Ikudome realizes the benefit of increased dynamic control by using a database to store and retrieve Internet filtering and redirecting rules (column 2, lines 45-6). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

With respect to claim 19, Binding fails to disclose a forwarding engine that moves a packet to the control engine.

Ikudome discloses a forwarding engine or networking server (102 of Figure 2) that moves packets to the Internet (110 of Figure 2; viewed as equivalent to a port) when the packet is ready for transport.

Art Unit: 2616

Ikudome realizes the benefit of obtaining reporting and adding more rules by using a forwarding engine separately from a control engine (column 4, line 50 – column 5, line 10). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

With respect to claim 20, Binding fails to disclose examining the packet for HTTP requests.

Ikudome teaches checking if the packet is HTTP type (column 6, lines 43-45).

Ikudome realizes the benefit of additional dynamic control for filtering and redirecting Internet traffic by examining Internet packets for HTTP requests (column 2, lines 45-67). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding in view of Ikudome and further in view of Bushkin (US 2003/0135548).

With respect to claim 3, Binding does not disclose creating a redirect message with a timeout value for the client.

Bushkin, in an invention related to redirecting web pages, discloses displaying an error web screen on the client machine (Figure 1, Figure 2) when the original web page is not available. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the use of this technique when a redirection server changes the client web URL address. Bushkin must also disclose a timeout value used before the client is move to a corrected web page address.

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of improved user interfaces by showing the client a redirecting page notification before moving to the redirected page. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Bushkin with the method of Binding.

With respect to claim 4, Binding does not disclose a timeout value or a policy used to create a timeout value.

Ikudome discloses a method of examining packets based on rules (206 of Figure 2; column 4, lines 33-49; where the database holds the rules for a client).

Bushkin discloses displaying an error web screen on the client machine (Figure 1, Figure 2) when the original web page is not available that must also have a timeout value used before the client is move to a corrected web page address. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the use the rules in Ikudome to associates a timeout value of Bushkin for a specific client requesting a web page.

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of additional security by redirecting packet based on the client identity as shown in Ikudome. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of improved user interfaces by showing the client a redirecting page notification before moving to the redirected page. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome and Bushkin with the method of Binding.

4. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding in view of Ikudome and further in view of Narad et al. (US 6,401,117; hereafter Narad).

With respect to claims 5 and 18, Binding does not disclose configuring the system with API.

Narad, in an invention related to software library development, discloses a packet processing library with an API configuration (column 5, lines 7-9).

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of wider market compatibility by using a Windows API as shown in Narad. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Narad with the method of Binding.

5. Claim 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding in view of Ikudome and further in view of Varghese et al. (US 6,449,256; hereafter Varghese).

With respect to claims 6 and 17, Binding does not disclose checking for replacement policies and replacing the original policies if there are replacement policies.

Varghese, in an invention related to network rules or routing policies, discloses that if extra rules are present then the current rules are swapping out with the extra rules (column 5, lines 24-26).

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of increased flexibility by using a updates rules as shown in Varghese. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Varghese with the method of Binding.

Art Unit: 2616

6. Claims 8, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding in view of Ikudome and further in view of Kumar et al. (US 7,085,279; hereafter Kumar).

With respect to claim 8, Binding discloses a method with a network element (46, 47 of Figure 2) that redirects client requests for web pages (Abstract). This method receives a packet with a HTTP request from a client (10 of Figure 2; 300 of Figure 3D; 310 of Figure 3D) and employs a gateway or redirect facility (46 of Figure 2) that forwarding replies to a client with a redirected URL address (312 of Figure 3D; column 8, lines 53-60).

Binding fails to disclose the steps of examining the packet based on a policy to determine if the packet should be redirected.

Ikudome, in an invention related to redirecting packet, discloses a method of examining packets based on rules (206 of Figure 2; column 4, lines 33-49; where the database holds the rules for a client) with a redirection server (208 of Figure 2; column 6, lines 37-59; where the decision to redirect is based on the client or source address in the packet).

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of additional security by redirecting packet based on the client identity as shown in Ikudome. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

Kumar, in the same field of endeavor, discloses a computer readable medium storing a program to perform a connection setup over a packet network in conjunction

Art Unit: 2616

with a switching network. The computer-readable medium is an electronic, magnetic, optical, or other physical device or means that can be contain or store a computer program for use by or in connection with a computer-related system or method (column 7, lines 51-67). One skilled in the art would have clearly recognized that the method of Binding would have been implemented in a software module. The implemented software would perform the function with less expense and more flexibility. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have use the technique in Binding as and implement it as taught by Kumar in order to reduce cost and improve the adaptability and flexibility of the networking system.

With respect to claim 9, Binding further discloses that the packet is sent to its original destination from a physical interface on main processing system (47 of Figure 2; 315 of Figure 3A) when more redirection is required (410, 430 of Figure 4).

With respect to claim 14, Binding fails to disclose examining the packet for HTTP requests.

Ikudome teaches checking if the packet is HTTP type (column 6, lines 43-45). One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of additional security by redirecting packet based on the client identity as shown in Ikudome. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome with the method of Binding.

7. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding in view of Ikudome in view of Kumar and further in view of Bushkin.

With respect to claim 10, Binding does not disclose creating a redirect message with a timeout value for the client.

Bushkin, in an invention related to redirecting web pages, discloses displaying an error web screen on the client machine (Figure 1, Figure 2) when the original web page is not available. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the use of this technique when a redirection server changes the client web URL address. Bushkin must also disclose a timeout value used before the client is move to a corrected web page address.

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of improved user interfaces by showing the client a redirecting page notification before moving to the redirected page. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Bushkin with the method of Binding.

With respect to claim 11, Binding does not disclose a timeout value or a policy used to create a timeout value.

Ikudome discloses a method of examining packets based on rules (206 of Figure 2; column 4, lines 33-49; where the database holds the rules for a client).

Bushkin discloses displaying an error web screen on the client machine (Figure 1, Figure 2) when the original web page is not available that must also have a timeout value used before the client is move to a corrected web page address. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the use the rules in Ikudome to associates a timeout value of Bushkin for a specific client requesting a web page.

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of additional security by redirecting packet based on the client identity as shown in Ikudome. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of improved user interfaces by showing the client a redirecting page notification before moving to the redirected page. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Ikudome and Bushkin with the method of Binding.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding in view of Ikudome in view of Kumar and further in view of Narad.

With respect to claim 12, Binding does not disclose configuring the system with API.

Narad, in an invention related to software library development, discloses a packet processing library with an API configuration (column 5, lines 7-9).

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of wider market compatibility by using a Windows API as shown in Narad. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Narad with the method of Binding.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding in view of Ikudome in view of Kumar and further in view of Varghese.

With respect to claim 13, Binding does not disclose checking for replacement policies and replacing the original policies if there are replacement policies.

Varghese, in an invention related to network rules or routing policies, discloses that if extra rules are present then the current rules are swapping out with the extra rules (column 5, lines 24-26).

One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefit of increased flexibility by using a updates rules as shown in Varghese. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the technique of Varghese with the method of Binding.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian T. O'Connor whose telephone number is 571-270-1081. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM-6:30PM, M-F, 1st Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian T. O'Connor
May 3, 2007



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600